

#### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Applicants' amendment filed 8 January 2010 and an interview with the Applicants' Representative, Dawn-Marie Bey on April 5, 2010. Applicants' amendment amended Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, and 19 and cancelled Claims 2, 14, and 16. Claims 1, 9, and 15 are amended herein, and are currently pending and allowed below.

#### EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An Examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it **MUST** be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee. Authorization for this Examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Dawn-Marie Bey on April 5, 2010.

The application has been amended as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method for determining the maturity level of a company in view of multiple maturity models to meet process certification requirements comprising:  
with a computer processor:  
providing individual requirements of the multiple maturity models in accordance with process certification requirements on a display;  
receiving generalized work products through a user interface and storing the generalized work products in a first table;  
with a computer processor, relating the individual requirements of the multiple maturity models stored in at least a second table to the generalized work products stored in the first table;  
receiving company-specific work products through a user interface and storing the company-specific work products in a third table;  
with a computer processor, associating at least some of the company-specific work products stored in the third table with at least some of the generalized work products stored in the first table;

Art Unit: 3624

with a computer processor, tracing the company-specific work products stored in the third table to the individual requirements of the multiple maturity models stored in at least the second table through the association of the at least some company-specific work products stored in the third table with at least some of the generalized work products stored in the first table;

with a computer processor, generating an association user interface that lists the company-specific work products adjacent to the generalized work products of the multiple maturity models and that shows associations between the generalized work products of the multiple maturity models and the company-specific work products on a display;

with a computer processor, receiving input through the association user interface comprising one of: creating an association between listed company-specific work products and adjacent generalized work products of the multiple maturity models; and removing an association between listed company-specific work products and generalized work products of the multiple maturity models;

providing an indicator of the maturity level of the company in view of each the multiple maturity models, wherein the maturity level indicates whether the organization is certified at that maturity level.

2. (Cancelled)
3. (Original) The method according to Claim 1, wherein the at least one maturity model includes multiple levels of maturity.
4. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 3, wherein the indicator of maturity is indicative of the highest of the multiple levels of maturity attained by the company.
5. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 4, wherein the indicator of maturity is a percentage.
6. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 1, wherein the indicator of maturity is provided in a report and the report includes a list of the individual requirements of the multiple maturity models that were not traceable to at least one of the company-specific work products.
7. (Original) The method according to Claim 6, wherein report further includes a list of company-specific work products that were not associated with the generalized work products.
8. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 6, wherein the indicator of maturity is a percentage.

Art Unit: 3624

9. (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method ~~for using a maturity tracing system in order~~ to determine the maturity level of an organization in view of multiple maturity models to meet process certification requirements comprising:

with a computer processor:

receiving data indicative of organization-specific work products into a maturity tracing system through a first user interface and storing the organization-specific work products in a first table;

with a computer processor, associating at least some of the organization-specific work products stored in the first table with at least some pre-existing generalized work products received with the maturity tracing system through a second user interface and stored in a second table;

receiving a request through a third user interface for tracing of the organization-specific work products stored in the first table to maturity requirements for the multiple maturity models stored in at least a third table, wherein the maturity tracing system includes at least one computer application for relating the pre-existing generalized work products stored in the second table to the maturity requirements for the multiple maturity models stored in at least the third table;

listing the organization-specific work products adjacent to the pre-existing generalized work products of the at least one maturity model with a fourth user interface that shows associations between the pre-existing- generalized work products of the multiple maturity models and the organization-specific work products on a display;

with a computer processor, receiving input through the fourth user interface comprising one of: creating an association between listed organization-specific work products and pre-existing generalized work products of the multiple maturity models; and removing an association between listed organization-specific work products and pre-existing generalized work products of the multiple maturity models;

receiving a request for a report indicating the maturity level of the organization in view of each of the multiple maturity models through a fifth user interface, wherein the maturity level indicates whether the organization is certified at that maturity level based on process certification requirements; and

displaying the report on a display.

10. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 9, further comprising: querying text indicative of at least one of the pre-existing generalized work products and the maturity requirements for the multiple maturity models in order to ascertain description information therefore.

11. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 10, wherein the description information is provided in a pop-up window.

12. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 10, wherein the description information is provided through a hyperlink.

Art Unit: 3624

13. (Previously Amended) The method according to Claim 10, further comprising listing in a fifth user interface organization-specific work products which do not match one of pre-existing- generalized work products and maturity requirements for the multiple maturity models.

14. (Cancelled)

15. (Currently Amended) A computer system for determining the maturity level of a company in view of multiple maturity models to meet process certification requirements comprising:

computer system architecture in communication with at least one relational database coupled to a graphical user interface (GUI), wherein the computer system includes a processor and a memory, the processor and memory configured to:

~~computer means for storing~~ store data representative of generalized work products in a first table, data representative of individual requirements for the multiple maturity models in accordance with process certification requirements in at least a second table, and data representative of the company-specific work products in a third table;

~~at the~~ least one relationship relational database for relating the data representative of generalized work products stored in the first table to the data representative of individual requirements for the multiple maturity models stored in at least the second table;

~~a computer means for prompting~~ prompt in a first user interface the association of the data representative of the company-specific work products stored in the third table to the data representative of generalized work products stored in the first table;

~~a computer means for tracing~~ trace the data representative of the company-specific work products stored in the third table to the data representative of individual requirements for the multiple maturity models stored in at least the second table;

~~a computer means for listing~~ list in a second user interface the company-specific work products adjacent to the generalized work products of the multiple maturity models, the second user interface showing associations between the generalized work products of the multiple maturity models and the company-specific work products on a display;

~~a computer means for receiving~~ receive input through the second user interface, the input through the second user interface comprising one of: creating an association between listed company-specific work products and generalized work products of the multiple maturity models; and deleting an association between listed company-specific work products and generalized work products of the multiple maturity models; and

~~a computer means for providing and displaying~~ provide and display an indicator of the maturity level of the company in view of each of the multiple maturity models, wherein the maturity level indicates whether the organization is certified at that maturity level based on process certification requirements.

16. (Cancelled).

Art Unit: 3624

17. (Previously Presented) The system according to Claim 15, further comprising a user interface for collecting the data, wherein the user interface comprises data input means and data viewing means.

18. (Previously Presented) The system according to Claim 17, wherein the data input means includes at least one of a keyboard, a network connection, and a port.

19. (Currently Amended) The system according to Claim 15, further comprising a computer application for listing in a third user interface company-specific work products which do not match one of pre-existing generalized work products and maturity requirements for the multiple maturity models.

20. (Previously Presented) The system of Claim 15, wherein the second user interface displays a listing of a plurality of maturity models, the computer application of the second user interface further receiving input comprising a selection of one of the plurality of maturity models.

#### REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

5. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The present invention is directed to a computer-implemented method and system determining the maturity level of a company in view of multiple maturity models wherein the maturity level indicates whether the organization is certified at that maturity level based on process certification requirements.

The closest prior art, Paulk et al. (Paulk), "Capability Maturity Model for Software, Version 1.1", Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, 1993, in view of Bowman-Amuah (U.S. 6,256,773) fail to teach either singularly or in combination a method/system for determining the maturity level of a company in view of multiple maturity models to meet process certification requirements. Although Paulk in view of Bowman-Amuah generally, but not specifically, teach:

receiving generalized work products through a user interface and storing the generalized work products in a first table;

with a computer processor, relating the individual requirements of the multiple maturity models stored in at least a second table to the generalized work products stored in the first table;

receiving company-specific work products through a user interface and storing the company-specific work products in a third table;

with a computer processor, associating at least some of the company-specific work products stored in the third table with at least some of the generalized work products stored in the first table;

with a computer processor, tracing the company-specific work products stored in the third table to the individual requirements of the multiple maturity models stored in at least the second table through the

Art Unit: 3624

association of the at least some company-specific work products stored in the third table with at least some of the generalized work products stored in the first table;

with a computer processor, generating an association user interface that lists the company-specific work products adjacent to the generalized work products of the multiple maturity models and that shows associations between the generalized work products of the multiple maturity models and the company-specific work products on a display;

with a computer processor, receiving input through the association user interface comprising one of: creating an association between listed company-specific work products and adjacent generalized work products of the multiple maturity models; and removing an association between listed company-specific work products and generalized work products of the multiple maturity models as recited in independent Claims 1, 9, and 15, Paulk in view of Bowman-Amauh, fail to teach either singularly or in combination a method/system for determining the maturity level of a company in view of multiple maturity models to meet process certification requirements:

with a computer processor:

providing individual requirements of the multiple maturity models in accordance with process certification requirements on a display;

providing an indicator of the maturity level of the company in view of each the multiple maturity models, wherein the maturity level indicates whether the organization is certified at that maturity level, as recited in independent Claims 1, 9, and 15.

Further, Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, page 8, fifth paragraph through page 9, last paragraph with respect to Paulk in view of Bowman-Amuah have been fully considered and are persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Application/Control Number: 10/690,657  
Art Unit: 3624

Page 8

/Jonathan G. Sterrett/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS MANSFIELD whose telephone number is (571)270-1904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30 am-6 pm, alt. Fridays.

Art Unit: 3624

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boswell Beth can be reached on 571-272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3624

5 April 2010  
Thomas Mansfield